
An Introduction to Lattice Chiral Fermions

Herbert Neuberger

Department of Physics and Astronomy, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ08540,
USA neuberger@physics.rutgers.edu

This write-up starts by introducing lattice chirality to people possessing a fairly modern mathematical background, but little prior knowledge about modern physics. I then proceed to present two new and speculative ideas.

1 Review

1.1 What are Dirac/Weyl fermions ?

One can think about (Euclidean) Field Theory as of an attempt to define integrals over function spaces [1]. The functions are of different types and are called fields. The integrands consist of a common exponential factor multiplied by various monomials in the fields. The exponential factor is written as $\exp(S)$ where the action S is a functional of the fields. Further restrictions on S are: (1) locality (2) symmetries. Locality means that S can be written as an integral over the base space (space-time) which is the common domain of all fields and the integrand at a point depends at most exponentially weakly on fields at other, remote, space-time points. S is required to be invariant under an all important group of symmetries that act on the fields. In a sense, S is the simplest possible functional obeying the symmetries and generically represents an entire class of more complicated functionals, which are equivalently appropriate for describing the same physics.

Dirac/Weyl fields have two main characteristics: (1) They are Grassmann valued, which means they are anti-commuting objects and (2) there is a form of S , possibly obtained by adding more fields, where the Dirac/Weyl fields, ψ , enter only quadratically. The Grassmann nature of ψ implies that the familiar concept of integration needs to be extended. The definition of integration over Grassmann valued fields is algebraic and for an S where the ψ fields enter quadratically, as in $S = \bar{\psi} K \psi + \dots$, requires only the propagator, K^{-1} , and the determinant, $\det K$. Hence, only the linear properties of the operator K come into play, and concepts like a “Grassmann integration measure” are, strictly

speaking, meaningless, although they make sense for ordinary, commuting, field integration variables.

Let us focus on a space-time that is a 4D Euclidean flat four torus, with coordinates x_μ , $\mu = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Introduce the quaternionic basis σ_μ represented by 2×2 matrices:

$$\sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \sigma_4 = \begin{pmatrix} i & 0 \\ 0 & -i \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

The ψ fields are split into two kinds, $\bar{\psi}$ and ψ , each being a two component function on the torus. In the absence of other fields the Weyl operators playing the role of the kernel K are $W = \sigma_\mu \partial_\mu$ and $W^\dagger = -\sigma_\mu^\dagger \partial_\mu$. The Dirac operator is made by combining the Weyl operators:

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & W \\ -W^\dagger & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma_\mu \\ \sigma_\mu^\dagger & 0 \end{pmatrix} \partial_\mu \equiv \gamma_\mu \partial_\mu = -D^\dagger \quad (2)$$

The σ_μ obey

$$\sigma_\mu^\dagger \sigma_\nu + \sigma_\nu^\dagger \sigma_\mu = 2\delta_{\mu\nu} \quad \sigma_\mu \sigma_\nu^\dagger + \sigma_\nu \sigma_\mu^\dagger = 2\delta_{\mu\nu} \quad (3)$$

which implies $W^\dagger W = -\partial_\mu \partial_\mu = -\partial^2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. Thus, one can think about W as a complex square root of the Laplacian. Similarly, one has $D^\dagger D = DD^\dagger = -D^2$, with D^2 being $-\partial^2$ times a 4×4 unit matrix.

When we deal with gauge theories there are other important fields [2]. These are the gauge fields, which define a Lie algebra valued one-form on the torus, denoted by $A \equiv A_\mu dx_\mu$. We shall take $A_\mu(x)$ to be an anti-hermitian, traceless, $N \times N$ matrix. The 1-form defines parallel transport of N -component complex fields Φ by:

$$\Phi(x(1)) = \mathcal{P} e^{\int_C A \cdot dx} \Phi(x(0)) \quad (4)$$

where $x_\mu(t)$, $t \in [0, 1]$ is a curve $\mathcal{C}$ connecting $x(0)$ to $x(1)$ and $\mathcal{P}$ denotes path ordering, the ordered product of $N \times N$ matrices being implicit in the exponential symbol. Covariant derivatives, $D_\mu = \partial_\mu - A_\mu$, have as main property the transformation rule:

$$g^\dagger(x) D_\mu(A) g(x) = D_\mu(A^g) \quad A^g \equiv A - g^\dagger dg \quad (5)$$

where the $g(x)$ are unitary $N \times N$ matrices with unit determinant. The replacement of ∂_μ by D_μ is known as the principle of minimal substitution and defines A -dependent Weyl and Dirac operators. A major role is played by local gauge transformations, defined by $\psi \rightarrow g\psi$, $\bar{\psi} \rightarrow \bar{\psi}g^\dagger$ and $A \rightarrow A^g$ where ψ is viewed as a column and $\bar{\psi}$ as a row. The gauge transformations make up an infinite invariance group and only objects that are invariant under this group are of physical interest. In particular, S itself must be gauge invariant

and the ψ dependent part of it is of the form $S_\psi = \int_x \bar{\psi} W \psi$ with W possibly replaced by $W^\dagger$ or by D .

Formally, W^{-1} is gauge covariant and $\det W$ is gauge invariant. Both the construction of W and of D meet with some problems: (1) W may have exact “zero modes”, reflecting a nontrivial analytical index. The latter is an integer defined as $\dim \text{Ker} W^\dagger(A) - \dim \text{Ker} W(A)$. It is possible for this integer to be non-zero because the form A is required to be smooth only up to gauge transformations. The space of all A ’s then splits into a denumerable collection of disconnected components, uniquely labelled by the index. The integration over A is split into a sum over components with associated integrals restricted to each component. (2) $\det W$ cannot always be defined in a gauge invariant way, but $\det(W^\dagger W) = |\det W|^2$ can. Thus, $\det W$ is to be viewed as a certain square root of $|\det W|^2$, but, instead of being a function over the spaces of A it is a line bundle. As a line bundle it can be also viewed as a line bundle over the space of gauge orbits of A , where a single orbit is the collection of all elements A^g for a fixed A and all g . The latter bundle may be twisted, and defy attempts to find a smooth gauge invariant section. When this happens we have an anomaly.

1.2 Why is there a problem on the lattice ?

Lattice field theory [3] tries to construct the desired functional integral by first replacing space-time by a finite, uniform, toroidal square lattice and subsequently constructing a limit in which the lattice spacing, a , is taken to zero. Before the limit is taken functional integration is replaced by ordinary integration producing well defined quantities. One tries to preserve as much as possible of the desired symmetry, and, in particular, there is a symmetry group of lattice gauge transformations given by $\prod_x SU(N)$, where x denotes now a discrete lattice site.

The one-form A is replaced by a collection of elementary parallel transporters, the link matrices $U_\mu(x)$, which are unitary and effect parallel transport from the site x to the neighboring site to x in the positive μ direction. Traversal in the opposite direction goes with $U_\mu^\dagger(x)$. The fields $\bar{\psi}$ and ψ are now defined at lattice sites only. As a result, $W, W^\dagger$ become finite square matrices. Here are the main problems faced by this construction: (1) The space of link variables is connected in an obvious way and therefore the index of W will vanish always. Indeed, W is just a square matrix. (2) $\det W$ is always gauge invariant, implying that anomalies are excluded. In particular, there no longer is any need to stop the construction at the intermediate step of a line bundle. These properties show that no matter how we proceed, the limit where the lattice spacing a goes to zero will not have the required flexibility.

1.3 The basic idea of the resolution

The basic idea of the resolution [4] is to reintroduce a certain amount of indeterminacy by adding to the lattice version a new infinite dimensional space in which ψ is an infinite vector, in addition to its other indices. Other fields do not see this space, and different components of ψ are accordingly referred to as flavors. Among all fields, only the ψ fields come in varying flavors. W shall be replaced by a linear operator that acts nontrivially in the new flavor space in addition to its previous actions. The infinite dimensional structure is chosen as simple as possible to provide for, simultaneously, good mathematical control, the emergence of a non-zero index and the necessity of introducing an intermediary construction of $\det W$ as a line bundle [5].

The structure of the lattice W operator is that of a lattice Dirac type operator. This special lattice Dirac operator, D , has a mass, acting linearly in flavor space. With this mass term, the structure of our lattice D is:

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} aM^\dagger & aW \\ -aW^\dagger & aM \end{pmatrix} \quad (6)$$

Only M acts nontrivially in flavor space. To obtain a single Weyl field relevant for the subspace corresponding to small eigenvalues of $-D^2$, the operator M is required to satisfy: (1) the index of M is unity (2) the spectrum of $MM^\dagger$ is bounded from below by a positive number, Λ^2 . $(\Lambda a)^2$ is of order unity and kept finite and fixed as $a \rightarrow 0$. In practice it is simplest to set the lattice spacing a to unity and take all other quantities to be dimensionless. Dimensional analysis can always be used to restore the powers of a . In the continuum, we always work in the units in which $c = \hbar = 1$. Numerical integration routines never know what a is in length units. The lower bound on $MM^\dagger$ is taken to be of order unity.

The index structure of M ensures that, for eigenvalues of $-D^2$ that are small relative to unity, the relevant space is dominated by vectors with vanishing upper components. These vectors are acted on by the W sub-matrix of D . Moreover, the main contribution comes from the zero mode of M , so, both the infinite flavor space and the extra doubling implicit in using a Dirac operator, become irrelevant for the small eigenvalues of $-D^2$ and their associated eigenspace.

The standard choice for M stems from a paper by Callan and Harvey [6] which has been ported to the lattice by Kaplan [7]. The matrix M is given by a first order differential (or difference) operator of the form $-\partial_s + f(s)$, where s is on the real line and represents flavor space. $f(s)$ is chosen to be the sign function, but could equally well just have different constant absolute values for s positive and for s negative.

The construction of the lattice determinant line bundle will not be reviewed here and we shall skip ahead directly to the overlap Dirac operator.

1.4 The overlap Dirac operator

The continuum Dirac operator combines two independent Weyl operators. The Weyl components stay decoupled so long as there is no mass term, and admit independently acting symmetries. Thus, zero mass Dirac fields have more symmetry than massive ones. In particular, this implies that radiative corrections to small Dirac masses must stay proportional to the original mass, to ensure exact vanishing in the higher symmetry case. A major problem in particle physics is to understand why all masses are so much smaller than the energy at which all gauge interactions become of equal strength and one of the most important examples of a possible explanation is provided by the mechanism of chiral symmetry. Until about six years ago it was believed that one could not keep chiral symmetries on the lattice and therefore lattice work with small masses required careful tuning of parameters.

Once we have a way to deal with individual Weyl fermions, it must be possible to combine them pair-wise just as in the continuum and end up with a lattice Dirac operator that is exactly massless by symmetry. This operator is called the overlap Dirac operator and is arrived at by combining the two infinite flavor spaces of each Weyl fermion into a new single infinite space [8]. However, unlike the infinite space associated with each Weyl fermion, the combined space can be viewed as the limit of a finite space. This is so because the Dirac operator does not have an index – unlike the Weyl operator – nor does it have an ill defined determinant. Thus, there is no major problem if the lattice Dirac operator is approximated by a finite matrix. The two flavor spaces are combined simply by running the coordinate s first over the values for one Weyl component and next over the values for the other Weyl component. Since one Weyl component comes as the hermitian conjugate of the other it is no surprise that the coordinate s will be run in opposite direction when it is continued. Thus, one obtains an infinite circle, with a combined function $f(s)$ which is positive on half of the circle and negative on the other. The circle can be made finite and then one has only approximate chiral symmetry [9]. One can analyze the limit when the circle goes to infinity and carry out the needed projection on the small eigenvalue eigenspaces to restrict one to only the components that would survive in the continuum limit. The net result is a formula for the lattice overlap Dirac operator, D_o [8].

To explain this formula one needs, as a first step, to introduce the original lattice Dirac operator due to Wilson, D_W . That matrix is the most sparse one possible with the right symmetry properties, excepting chiral symmetry. It is used as a kernel of the more elaborate construction needed to produce D_o . Any alternative to D_W will produce, by the same construction, a new D_o , possibly enhancing some of its other properties. The original D_o is still the most popular, because the numerical advantage of maximal sparseness of D_W has proven hard to beat by benefits coming from other improvements. Thus, we restrict ourselves here only to D_W .

$$D_W = m + 4 - \sum_{\mu} V_{\mu}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
V_\mu &= \frac{1-\gamma_\mu}{2}T_\mu + \frac{1+\gamma_\mu}{2}T_\mu^\dagger \\
\langle x|T_\mu|\Phi^i\rangle &= U_\mu(x)^{ij}\langle x|\Phi^j\rangle \\
U_\mu(x)U_\mu^\dagger(x) &= 1 \quad \gamma_\mu = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma_\mu \\ \sigma_\mu^\dagger & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \gamma_5 = \gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3\gamma_4
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

It is easy to see that $V_\mu V_\mu^\dagger = 1$, so D_W is bounded. $H_W = \gamma_5 D_W$ is hermitian and sparse. The parameter m must be chosen in the interval $(-2, 0)$, and typically is around -1 . For gauge fields that are small, the link matrices are close to unity and a sizable interval around zero can be shown to contain no eigenvalues of H_W [10]. This spectral gap can close for certain gauge configurations, but these can be excluded by a simple local condition on the link matrices. When that condition is obeyed, and otherwise independently on the gauge fields, all eigenvalues of H_W^2 are bigger than some positive number μ^2 . This makes it possible to unambiguously define the sign function of H_W , $\epsilon(H_W)$. As a matrix, ϵ is no longer sparse, but, for $\mu^2 > 0$, it still is true that entries associated with lattice sites separated by distances much larger than $\frac{1}{\mu}$ are exponentially small.

The exclusion of some configurations ruins the simple connectivity of the space of link variables just as needed to provide for a lattice definition of the integer n , which in the continuum labels the different connected components of gauge orbit space. The appropriate definition of n on the lattice is [11]

$$n = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \epsilon(H_W) \tag{8}$$

It is obvious that it gives an integer since H_W must have even dimensions as is evident from the structure of the γ -matrices. Moreover, it becomes very clear why configuration for which H_W could have a zero eigenvalue needed to be excised. These configurations were first found to need to be excised when constructing the lattice version of the $\det W$ line bundle.

The overlap Dirac operator is

$$D_o = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \gamma_5 \epsilon(H_W)) \tag{9}$$

γ_5 and ϵ make up a so called ‘‘Kato pair’’ with elegant algebraic properties [12].

1.5 What about the Ginsparg-Wilson relation ?

In practice, the inverse of D_o is needed more than D_o itself. Denoting $\gamma_5 \epsilon(H_W) = V$, where V is unitary and obeys ‘‘ γ_5 -hermiticity’’, $\gamma_5 V \gamma_5 = V^\dagger$, we easily prove that $D_o^{-1} = \frac{2}{1+V}$ obeys

$$\{\gamma_5, D_o^{-1} - 1\} = 0 \tag{10}$$

Here, we introduced the anti-commutator $\{a, b\} \equiv ab + ba$. In the continuum, the same relation is obeyed by D^{-1} and reflects chiral symmetry. We see that

a slightly altered propagator will be chirally symmetric. The above equation, modifying the continuum relation $\{\gamma_5, D^{-1}\} = 0$, was first written down by Ginsparg and Wilson (GW) in 1982 [14] in a slightly different form. By a quirk of history, their paper became famous only after the discovery of D_o . The main point of the GW paper is that shifting an explicitly chirally symmetric propagator by a matrix which is almost diagonal in lattice sites and unity in spinor space does not destroy physical chiral symmetry.

It turns out that the explicitly chirally symmetric propagator, $\frac{1-V}{1+V}$, can be used as the propagator associated with the monomials of the fields that multiply e^S , but in other places where the propagator appears (loops), one needs to use the more subtly chirally symmetric propagator, $D_o^{-1} = \frac{2}{1+V}$. This dichotomy is well understood and leads to no inconsistencies [15].

Any solution of the GW relation, if combined with γ_5 hermiticity, is of the form $\frac{2}{1+V}$, producing a propagator which anti-commutes with γ_5 of the form $\frac{1-V}{1+V}$. V is a unitary, γ_5 -hermitian, matrix. Thus the overlap is, essentially, the general γ_5 -hermitian solution to the GW relation. The overlap goes beyond the GW paper in providing a generic procedure to produce explicit acceptable matrices V starting from explicit matrices of the same type as H_W .

When the GW relation was first presented, in 1982, the condition of γ_5 -hermiticity was not mentioned. The solution was not written in terms of a unitary matrix V , and there was no explicit proposal for the dependence of the solution on the gauge fields. For these reasons, the paper fell into oblivion, until 1997, when D_o was arrived at by a different route. With the benefit of hindsight we see now that it was a mistake not to pursue the GW approach further.

In 1982 neither the mathematical understanding of anomalies - specifically the need to find a natural $U(1)$ bundle replacing the chiral determinant - nor the paramount importance of the index of the the Weyl components were fully appreciated. Only after these developments became widely understood did it become possible to approach the problem of lattice chirality from a different angle and be more successful at solving it. The convergence with the original GW insight added a lot of credence to the solution and led to a large number of papers based on the GW relation.

Already in 1982 GW showed that if a solution to their relation were to be found, the slight violation of anti-commutativity with γ_5 that it entailed, indeed was harmless, and even allowed for the correct reproduction of the continuum triangle diagram, the key to calculating anomalies. Thus, there was enough evidence in 1982 that should have motivated people to search harder for a solution, but this did not happen. Rather, the prevailing opinion was that chirality could not be preserved on the lattice, and several “experts” made careers out of consolidating this view. In retrospect, something did go wrong in the field’s collective thought process, but parallel developments mentioned earlier eventually provided an alternative, a “second chance” to deal with the problem correctly. Luckily, despite much opposition, this second chance was

not missed. After the discovery of D_o , fifteen years after the GW paper, a flood of new papers, developing the GW approach further, appeared. However, nothing truly new came out from this, because the overlap development already had produced all the new conceptual results. But, this renewed activity did provide enough of a social basis in the field to finally eradicate the misplaced “wisdom” of the intervening years.

1.6 Basic implementation

Numerically the problem is to evaluate $\epsilon(H_W)$ on a vector, without storing it, basing oneself on the sparseness of H_W . This can be done because, possibly after deflation, the spectrum of H_W has a gap around 0, the point where the sign function is discontinuous. In addition, since H_W is bounded we need to approximate the sign function well only in two disjoint segments, one on the positive real line and the other its mirror image on the negative side. A convenient form is the Higham representation, which introduces $\epsilon_n(x)$ as an approximation to the sign function:

$$\epsilon_n(x) = \begin{cases} \tanh[2n \tanh^{-1}(x)] & \text{for } |x| < 1 \\ \tanh[2n \tanh^{-1}(x^{-1})] & \text{for } |x| > 1 \\ x & \text{for } |x| = 1 \end{cases}$$

Equivalently,

$$\epsilon_n(x) = \frac{(1+x)^{2n} - (1-x)^{2n}}{(1+x)^{2n} + (1-x)^{2n}} = \frac{x}{n} \sum_{s=1}^n \frac{1}{x^2 \cos^2 \frac{\pi}{2n} (s - \frac{1}{2}) + \sin^2 \frac{\pi}{2n} (s - \frac{1}{2})} \quad (11)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_n(x) = \text{sign}(x)$$

$\epsilon_n(H_W)\psi$ can be evaluated using a single Conjugate Gradient (CG) iteration with multiple shifts for all the pole terms labelled by s above [16]. The cost in operations is that of a single CG together with an overhead that is linear in n and eventually dominates. The cost in storage is of $2n$ large vectors. The pole representation can be further improved using exact formulae due to Zolotarev who, essentially, was able to solve the Remez problem analytically for this case. However, for so called quenched simulations, where one replaces $\det D_o$ by unity in the functional integration, the best is to use a double pass [17] version introduced a few years ago but fully understood only recently [18]. In the double pass version storage and number of operations become n -independent for large n , which, for double precision calculations means an n larger than 30 or so. Thus, the precise form of the pole approximation becomes irrelevant and storage requirements are modest. In “embarrassingly parallel” simulations this is the method of choice because it simultaneously attains maximal numerical accuracy and allows maximal exploitation of machine cycles.

When one goes beyond the $\det D_o = 1$ approximation, one needs to reconsider methods that employ order n storage. A discussion of the relevant issues in this case would take us beyond the limits of this presentation; these issues will be covered by other speakers who are true experts.

2 Beyond Overlap/GW ?

The overlap merged with GW because both ideas exploited a single real extra coordinate. The starting point of the overlap construction however seems more general, since it would allow a mass matrix in infinite flavor space even if the latter were associated with two or more coordinates. Thus, one asks whether using two extra coordinates might lead to a structurally new construction [19]. While this might not be better in practice, it at least has the potential of producing something different, unattainable if one just sticks to the well understood GW track.

The function $f(s)$ from the overlap is replaced now by two functions $f_1(s_1)$ and $f_2(s_2)$ and the single differential operator $\partial_s + f(s)$ by two such operators, $d_\alpha = \partial_\alpha + f_\alpha(s_\alpha)$. Clearly, d_1 and d_2 commute. A mass matrix with the desired properties can be now constructed as follows:

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & -id_2^\dagger \\ id_2 & -d_1^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \quad (12)$$

The two dimensional plane spanned by s_α is split into four quadrants according to the pair of signs of f_α and, formally, the chiral determinant can be written as the trace of four Baxter Corner Transfer Matrices,

$$\text{chiral det} = \text{Tr}[K^{\text{I}}K^{\text{II}}K^{\text{III}}K^{\text{IV}}] \quad (13)$$

While this structure is intriguing, I have made no progress yet on understanding whether it provides a natural definition of a $U(1)$ bundle with the right properties. If it does, one could go over to the Dirac case, and an amusing geometrical picture seems to emerge. It is too early to tell whether this idea will lead anywhere or not.

3 Localization and Domain Wall Fermions

3.1 What are Domain Wall Fermions ?

Before the form of D_o was derived we had a circular s space with $f(s)$ changing sign at the opposite ends of a diameter. One of the semi-circles can be eliminated by taking $|f(s)|$ to infinity there, leaving us with a half circle that can be straightened into a segment with two approximate Weyl fields localized at its ends. This is known as the domain wall setup, the walls extending into

the physical directions of space-time. Keeping the length of the segment finite but large one has approximate chiral symmetry and an operator D_{DW} which acts on many Dirac fields, exactly one of them having a very small effective mass, and the rest having masses of order unity.

The chiral symmetry is only approximate because matrix elements of $\frac{1}{D_{DW}^\dagger D_{DW}}$ connecting entries associated with opposite ends of the segment, L and R , do not vanish exactly. Using a spectral decomposition of $D_{DW}^\dagger D_{DW}$ we have:

$$\langle L | \frac{1}{D_{DW}^\dagger D_{DW}} | R \rangle = \sum_n \frac{1}{\Lambda_n} \langle \Psi_n | R \rangle \langle \Psi_n | L \rangle^* \quad \langle \Psi_n | \Psi_n \rangle = 1 \quad (14)$$

Weyl states are localized at L and R and should not connect with each other. So long as the distance between R and L is infinite and $H_W^2 > \mu^2$ this is exactly proven to be the case. For a finite distance S , the correction goes as $e^{-\mu S}$. Unfortunately, μ can be very small numerically and this would require impractically large values of S . Note that the worse situation occurs if one has simultaneously a relatively large wave-function contribution, $|\langle \Psi_n | R \rangle \langle \Psi_n | L \rangle|$, and a small Λ_n . Unfortunately, this worse case seems to come up in practice.

3.2 The main practical problem

As already mentioned, for the purpose of keeping track of $\det D_o$, one may want to keep in the simulation the dependence on the coordinate s , or, what amounts to a logical equivalent, the n fields corresponding to the pole terms in the sign function truncation. This is the main reason to invest resources in domain wall simulations. In my opinion, if one works in the approximation where $\det D_o = 1$ it does not pay to deal with domain wall fermions because it is difficult to safely assess the magnitude of chirality violating effects in different observables.

The main problem faced by practical domain wall simulations is that in the range of interest for strong interaction (QCD) phenomenology H_W , the kernel of the overlap, has eigenstates with very small eigenvalues in absolute value. It turns out that these states are strongly localized in space-time. However, because of approximate translational invariance in s they hybridize into delocalized bands into the extra dimension. As such, they provide channels by which the Weyl modes at the two locations L and R , where the combined $f(s)$ vanishes, communicate with each other, spoiling the chiral symmetry. To boot, these states have small Λ_n . The one way known to eliminate this phenomenon is to take the separation between the Weyl modes to infinity. This leads to the overlap where the problem becomes only of a numerical nature and is manageable by appropriately deflating H_W to avoid the states for which the reconstruction of the sign function by iterative means is too expensive.

3.3 The new idea

The new idea is to exploit the well known fact that one dimensional random systems typically always localize. The standard approach uses a homogeneous s coordinate; translations in s would be a symmetry, except for the points at the boundary. Suppose we randomized to some degree the operators H_W strung along the s -direction, randomly breaking s -translations also locally. This would evade hybridization, making localized states in the s direction. Now the hope is that the right amount of disorder would affect only the states made out of the eigenstates of H_W that are localized in the space-time direction because these states have small eigenvalues making the basis for the hybridized states decay slowly in the s direction.

The problem boils down to invent the right kind, and discover the right amount, of randomness that would achieve the above. A simple idea is to randomize somewhat the parameter m in H_W as a function of s . A numerical test of this idea, with a small amount of randomness, has been carried out together with F. Berruto, T. W. Chiu and R. Narayanan. It turned out that the amount of randomness we used was too small to have any sizable effect. The test did show however that if the randomness is very small nothing is lost, so we have something we can smoothly modify away from. However the computational resources needed for a more thorough experiment are beyond our means, so the matter is left unresolved.

4 Final words

Much progress has been attained on the problem of lattice chirality, both conceptually and in practical implementations. The old wisdom that symmetry is king in field theory has been again proven. However, there is room for further progress and new ideas can still lead to large payoffs; keep your eyes open !

5 Acknowledgments

Many thanks are due to the organizers of the “Third International Workshop on QCD and Numerical Analysis” for an exciting conference. My research is supported in part by the DOE under grant number DE-FG02-01ER41165.

References

1. M. E. Peskin, D. V. Schroeder, An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory, Addison-Wesley, (1995).
2. L. Alvarez-Gaume, Erice School Math. Phys. 0093 (1985).
3. M. Creutz, Quarks, gluons and lattices, Cambridge University Press, (1983).

4. R. Narayanan, H. Neuberger, Phys. Lett. B309, 344 (1993).
5. H. Neuberger, Phys. Rev. D59, 085006 (1999); H. Neuberger, Phys. Rev. D63, 014503 (2001); R. Narayanan, H. Neuberger, Nucl. Phys. B443, 305 (1995).
6. C. G. Callan, J. A. Harvey, Nucl. Phys. B250, 427 (1985).
7. D. B. Kaplan, Phys. Lett. B288, 342 (1992).
8. H. Neuberger, Phys. Lett. B417, 141 (1998).
9. H. Neuberger, Phys. Rev. D57, 5417 (1998).
10. H. Neuberger, Phys. Rev. D61, 085015 (2000).
11. R. Narayanan, H. Neuberger, Nucl. Phys. B412, 574 (1994); R. Narayanan, H. Neuberger, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 3251 (1993).
12. H. Neuberger, Chin. J. Phys. 38, 533 (2000); T. Kato, Perturbation theory for linear operators, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (1984).
13. H. Neuberger, Phys. Lett. B427, 353 (1998).
14. P. H. Ginsparg, K. G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. D25, 2649 (1982).
15. H. Neuberger, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 73, 697 (1999).
16. H. Neuberger, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 4060 (1998).
17. H. Neuberger, Int. J. Mod. Phys. C10, 1051 (1999).
18. Ting-Wai Chiu, Tung-Han Hsieh, hep-lat/0306025 (2003), Phys. Rev. E, to appear.
19. H. Neuberger, hep-lat/0303009 (2003).